

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,084	01/08/2001	James H. Waldo	06502.0110-01	6895
22852	7590 05/07/2004		EXAMI	NER
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER			GECKIL, MEHMET B	
LLP 1300 I STRE	EET. NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2142	7 1
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004	J-0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant/s)
_	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Astrono	09/755,084	WALDO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mehmet B. Geckil	2142
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a i eply within the statutory minimum of thir od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become At	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>	November 2003.	
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>8-24 and 26-39</u> is/are pending in th	e application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-24 and 26-39</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	I/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  Treceived in this National Stage
<ul> <li>13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78.</li> <li>a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language reference.</li> </ul>	first sentence of the specific	eation or in an Application Data Sheet.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of	stic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
Attachment(s)		
) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview S	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)

Art Unit: 2142

- 1. Claims 8-24 and 26-39 are presented for examination. Applicant should update status of the related applications cited throughout the application.
- 2. Rejection of claims 8-24 and 26-39 are maintained. Rejected claims are reproduced hereinbelow for the convenience.
- 3. Claims 8-24 and 26-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pal et al.
- 4. Pal et al (6,219,675) taught the invention substantially as claimed (e.g., exemplary claim 8) including a database data processing system having a lookup service or database service with associated services, e.g., query service available for use in the data processing system, comprising a navigational agent sending a callback message to a client computer where the callback message requesting a response when the client completed processing (e.g. updating) with a particular database object (col 5, line 23 et seq; col 6, line 57 et seq; and col 7, line 1 et seq.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking and database art at the time of the invention that the claimed invention differed from the teachings of Pal et al only by a degree, e.g. in the claimed lookup service and requesting notification particulars. It is well known to one skill in the art that lookup service as referred in the claims is an obvious variation of the database because databases are used for lookup services or for query services. The meaning of lookup and query are synonymous. For example, everyone knows how

Art Unit: 2142

to use Yaahoo and enter a query regarding a person's name or a zip code to receive weather information corresponding to the zip code location. Yahoo looks it up from its database and responds with the matching answer. Moreover, it is well known in the telephone services art to use lookup services of the telephone numbers for decades. Applicant is broadly claiming that when a lookup service is updated, the requesting client should be notified but this is exactly an obvious variation of Pal et al teaching of the callback message requesting a response when the client completed processing. All other variations of notification according to when or while the update occurs are all obvious variations of Pal et al teachings.

5. Applicant in the response argued that claims should be interpreted in light of the specification and the specification teaches djini at pages 12-13. Applicant is reminded that examiner has a duty to interpret the claims as broadly as possible in light of the specification and in this light it is no more than a database because functions performed are also performed by the databases as explained in the rejection hereinabove. The central registry or Djinn as applicant argues is not in the claims and applicant's argument is therefore improper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the network programming and database art to write various variations of the callback taught by Pall et al including callbacks requests originating from the client. Therefore, the rejection is proper. These set of claims are too broad for the issue and read on the prior art systems when interpreted as broadly as possible by the examiner. Claims will

Page 3

Art Unit: 2142

be indicated as allowable when the scope of the claims are narrowed down and differentiated clearly from the prior art systems.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beck et al (6,604,140) taught a lookup service using a registry for registration and updating (see col 2, lines 25-45.)

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehmet Geckil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M..

Art Unit: 2142

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Mark Powell, can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are listed hereinbelow.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700. Customer service number is (703) 306-5631.

## Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238 (for After final communications);

Or:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for status inquiry or informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

5/3/04

MEHMET B. GECKIL PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehrt God